



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/791,451	03/01/2004	Shlomit Wize	1662/59404	3457
26646	7590	12/04/2006	EXAMINER	
KENYON & KENYON LLP ONE BROADWAY NEW YORK, NY 10004			BERCH, MARK L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1624	

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/791,451

Applicant(s)

WIZEL ET AL.

Examiner

Mark L. Berch

Art Unit

1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 October 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 65-81 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 69-81 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 65-68 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Status of Claims*

The original rejection was done on the wrong set of claims. A supplemental rejection was sent out on the correct set of claims. A response was received (on the same day as the supplemental rejection was sent out), but it was to the original rejection. Accordingly, this rejection is being sent out, which is quite similar to the previous one, but is not made final since applicants did not see this prior to their response.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 68 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 68 is unclear. This is a particular Form of the hydrate, but how does one know that one has Form I as opposed to some other form? Form I of a hydrate is not defined in the specification.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Art Unit: 1624

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 65 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by 6107302.

The reference discloses the hydrate of "not more than 3%" (Column 3, line 25).

See also the material at column 6, line 42, prior to drying.

Applicants point to the material at column 1, line 55 and say that the product is described as an "anhydrous crystalline form". The actual text is as follows:

"Hereinafter by "anhydrous crystalline form" according to the invention, we mean a crystalline form..." This simply explains what that term means. It does not say that this is the only thing that they describe. It is merely the first thing. Indeed, column 2, lines 23-25 go on to set forth, "Accordingly in a second aspect of the invention there is provided valaciclovir hydrochloride having a water of hydration content of not more than 3% by weight..." It is this aspect of the reference which is being relied on.

Applicants refer to WO 97/25989, but that is essentially duplicative of the above reference.

Claims 65, 67 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 20060147519 A1.

Art Unit: 1624

Claims 65, 67, and 68 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by WO 2004000265 A2.

Claim 65 is not entitled to benefit of the parent. This claim covers any level of hydration. The parent discloses only 6-10%. Thus, Claim 67 is also not entitled to benefit of the parent, as this 8-10% range is not there.

The two documents are the same but have different effective dates.

Paragraph 0053 discloses hydrates having 5-7% water, anticipating all claims but 67. In addition, the Table 4, #3 formulation appears to have the hydrate of 8.9%, anticipating all claims on the assumption that these dried granules "prior to the addition of extragranular excipients" is just the valacyclovir HCl itself., which seems reasonable.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 67 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 20060147519 A1 or WO 2004000265 A2.

Note above. The 5-7% water would render the very similar "about 8%" obvious, especially since the reference teaches hydrate in general.

*Double Patenting*

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified

Art Unit: 1624

or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 65-68 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 26 of U.S. Patent No. 6849736.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the sesquihydrate according to the patent has between about 6% and about 9% water, overlapping these claims. The dihydrate has about 9.7%, again overlapping.

With regard to the process claims, while a compound and its synthesis are not patentably distinct, in the absence of a restriction requirement, this method is not present in 6849736, and hence the method claims are not rejected.

Claims 65-68 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 64 of copending Application No. 11042526. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because: While the hydrate of these claims is not the monohydrate (note specification, page 13, lines 6-8), the water amounts given would correspond to, or include, the dihydrate.

Art Unit: 1624


This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

With regard to the process claims, while a compound and its synthesis are not patentably distinct, in the absence of a restriction requirement, this method is not present in 11042526, and hence the method claims are not rejected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark L. Berch whose telephone number is 571-272-0663. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:15 - 3:45.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson can be reached on (571)272-0661. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and (571) 273-8300 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0198.

  
Mark L. Berch  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1624

11/29/2006